

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 -www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/814,425	03/21/2001	Everett X. Wang	42390.P11004	4061	
	75	590 05/13/2005	EXAMINER MOONEY, MICHAEL P			
	Dennis M. de	Guzman				
	BLAKELY, SC	OKOLOFF TAYLOR & Z				
	Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			2883		

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief							

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/814,425	WANG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Michael P. Mooney	2883

Bototo the timing of an tippout Bito.	Examiner	Alt Ollic							
•	Michael P. Mooney	2883	,						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED <u>21 April 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.							
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:									
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).									
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL									
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AMENDMENTS									
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);									
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• *	educing or simplifying	the issues for						
(d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.							
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	t (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		, timely filed amendn	nent canceling						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	the non-allowable claim(s).  7. So For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) so will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,7,16-19 and 22</u> .									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			•						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•								
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).									
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.									
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsidered but the reconsidered but the request for reconsidered but the reconsidered but the request for reconsidered but the reconsider	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).									
13.  Other:									

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of item 3 above: The chemical-mechanical process was considered for method claim 1, but raises new issues requiring further consideration in the amended device claim 16.

> Frank G. Font **Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800**